

## NOT VOTING—9

Bass	Huizenga (MI)	Ryan (WI)
Ellison	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)
Hanna	Ruiz	Whitfield

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1353

Mr. JEFFRIES changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. KATKO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the week, I was absent for legislative business; had I been present, I would have cast the following votes: rollcall 145—H.R. 1259—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 146—H.R. 1265—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 147—H.R. 1480—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 148—H. Res. 189—On Ordering the Previous Question—"yes," rollcall 149—H. Res. 189—On Agreeing to the Resolution—"yes."

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for two roll call votes on Tuesday, April 14, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner: rollcall Vote No. 148—Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule—"no," rollcall Vote No. 149—On Agreeing to the Resolution—"no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 189, Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, as amended, is considered as adopted.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII, and at the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Price of Georgia moves that the House take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, with the House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will remind my colleagues that, the week before we left for our Easter break, the House passed a budget in this Chamber and that the Senate passed a budget as well, and this motion does something very simple. It simply says that we will work to com-

bine the best features of those two resolutions: to restrain the size and the scope of government, to reduce spending, and to balance the budget without raising taxes.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Van Hollen moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the resolution S. Con. Res. 11 be instructed—

(1) to recede from its disagreement with the Senate with respect to section 363 of S. Con. Res. 11 (relating to the requirement for earned paid sick time to address the health needs of workers and their families); and

(2) to recede from subsection (c)(3) of section 808 of the House Amendment (relating to changing the current Medicare program, and replacing it with premium support payments).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The House has passed a budget. It is a budget that is wrong for America. It does not reflect our country's priorities, and it does not reflect our values. What it says to the American people is work harder and take home less. That is the House budget. We also have the Senate budget. The Senate budget is also wrong for America. The Senate budget also says to the American people work harder and take home less. That is the message.

When you have got a House budget that is wrong for America and a Senate budget that is wrong for America, both which say to the country "work harder and take home less," the midpoint between the two—or any point between the two—is also wrong for America and also says to the American people work harder and take home less.

Now, why do I say that both the House and the Senate budgets say "work harder and take home less"?

It is because, amazingly, they both actually increase the tax burden on working families. How? They actually phase out the increase in the child tax credit, which helps working families. They phase out the increase, or get rid of the increase, in the earned income

tax credit. They entirely get rid of the higher education deduction. These are deductions that families use to help make college more affordable. They get rid of the Affordable Care Act tax credits, which help millions of Americans afford health insurance. They are squeezing hard-working, middle class families.

At the same time, the House budget calls for a big tax cut for folks at the very high end of the income scale—for millionaires. If you look at the Romney-Ryan tax plan, which this budget green-lights—sort of paves the way for—it would call for a one-third cut in the top tax rate. That is a huge windfall for the wealthiest in the country in the same budget that is increasing the tax burden on working families.

What else do the Republican budgets do?

They disinvest in America. They slash way below the lowest historical levels in recorded history the amount that we invest in the categories of the budget that help our kids' educations—early education, K-12, special education. They devastate that part of the budget that is used to invest in innovation and in scientific research, things that have helped power our economy.

□ 1400

Their budget assumes that the transportation trust fund will run dry in a few months. That is not accounted for within their budget numbers.

So that is what the Republican budgets do, both the House budget and the Senate budget. There is no way to remedy those problems in conference because any point between those two is bad for America.

The only way to remedy it would be if we were able to instruct the conferees to adopt the House Democratic budget proposal that we put forward a few weeks ago which actually provides additional tax relief to working families. It significantly increases the child and dependent care tax credit, so if you are a working family and want to make sure your child is in quality health care, you are going to get a little bit more tax relief; or if you have an elderly loved one at home that you want to make sure has quality care, you get a little more tax relief. If you are a two-worker family, we scale back the marriage penalty. So the Democratic budget actually provides more tax relief for working Americans while the Republican budget provides tax increases to working families.

The Democratic budget also invests in our future—in our kids' education, in scientific research, in transportation—by closing a lot of the tax breaks in the Code that actually encourage American companies to move jobs and capital overseas. We get rid of those loopholes and say let's invest the money here in America. That is what the Democratic budget does. The rules don't permit us to instruct the conferees to do the right thing and adopt that alternative which does reflect the

values and priorities of people around the country.

There are two little things where the Senate budget is actually minusculely better than the House budget, but they are important things. They are important things that passed in the Senate with a large Democratic vote and some Republican Senators as well.

One is a provision to say let's provide a fund, let's provide room in the budget for earned paid sick leave so that moms and dads who have kids who are sick at home don't have to choose between forgoing their income and caring for their kid at home. They don't have to choose between worrying about making their rent payment or their mortgage payment or their grocery bill payment on time and making sure their kids are cared for when they are sick. That is part of the Senate budget. So we are asking our colleagues to instruct the conferees to at least adopt that one little glimmer of good news in the Senate budget.

The other difference relates to the House proposal to turn Medicare into a voucher program at the end of the budget window. What does that plan do? What it does is it shifts the risks of higher costs within the Medicare system onto the backs of seniors, and the Congressional Budget Office has shown that for those seniors who choose to remain in the traditional Medicare program, their premiums would go up significantly. That is what the House budget does. It voucherizes the Medicare program. The Senate budget does not. So we are asking our colleagues to accept the Senate version which is not good when it comes to Medicare generally, but at least on this one point is better than the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, that is our motion to instruct. I wish we could instruct the conferees to adopt the Democratic budget proposal which, as I said, says to working families: We hear you; we know you are working harder than ever; we know you feel like you are on a treadmill; we know a lot of you feel like you are falling behind; and we have a budget to help you.

The Republican budget doesn't do that. It doesn't help at all. But at least maybe, in these two little things, we can send a signal today that we understand that working families are struggling, and we want to make sure that we do something to help them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be so stuck in their Washington ways that they can't, they just can't see or recognize a positive solution when one is presented. I remind my colleague on the other side of the aisle that we are mired in the worst recovery, economic recovery in the modern era—the worst economic recovery in the modern era—slowest. In fact, there are fewer people working right now, Mr. Speaker, than there were

when the recession began. That is what the other side has brought us. They want to double down on these policies. The American people clearly understand that there is a better way. There are positive solutions that we ought to be putting in place.

I want to talk specifically about the Medicare proposal because the distortion and mischaracterization of the positive patient-centered solution that we have put forward in the area of Medicare continues over and over and over from our friends on the other side, and it really doesn't contribute to the important work, the important conversation that we must have as a nation.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that, as you know and the American people know, the Medicare program is going broke. That is not Representative PRICE saying that. That is not me saying that. That is the Medicare actuaries, the folks who are charged with letting us know, as a nation, how the program is doing from a financial standpoint. What they say is that it is not doing very well, and it is getting worse and worse and worse. In fact, in 2030, the fact of the matter is that the program will not be able to provide the services that have been promised to seniors.

So the solution for our friends on the other side is what? Do nothing. Stick your head in the sand. Don't worry about that. Don't pay any attention to that man behind the curtain. Nothing. Under their plan, seniors in this country are destined to inherit, in a very short period of time, a Medicare program that doesn't provide the services promised.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as a formerly practicing physician, folks are concerned. I hear from my medical colleagues daily—literally, daily—the concerns that they have about our healthcare system, and especially about the Medicare program and about the challenges that exist because of governmental intervention and because of the rules and the regulations that are heaped upon more rules and more regulations to make it more difficult for them to even care for patients.

So what do we believe is the appropriate thing to do? We think we ought to save and strengthen and secure Medicare. That is the right solution. So in spite of the mischaracterization of our friends on the other side about the proposal that we put forward, it is, indeed, to save and strengthen and secure Medicare. The fact of the matter is seniors understand and appreciate that, and they desire us, as a body, to come together and solve that challenge, solve that challenge together. So I invite my friends to join us in working together for a positive solution.

Further, I do want to thank my colleague for bringing this motion to the floor today because this is an important debate that we are having. The debate is very fundamental. It is about how we are to build a stronger nation,

how we are to provide greater opportunity for all Americans.

What we believe is that we recognize that the economy is not moving as it should, that wages are stagnant, that the economy is underperforming. At the very least, our friends on the other side ought to admit that we can do better. So it is a bit troubling to see that the policies that they continue to champion look remarkably similar to the sorts of policies that have been tried and, frankly, failed over the past 6 years. While our Nation has piled up trillions of dollars of more debt, our economy hasn't grown as it should. In fact, this has been, as I mentioned, the worst recovery in the modern era, leaving millions of Americans still struggling simply to make ends meet.

Our budget is a balanced budget, Mr. Speaker. We adopted a plan that would grow our economy, that would empower individuals, that would empower families and job creators in our local communities, all the while holding Washington accountable and protecting our Nation. Our budget, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, balances in less than 10 years, and it does so without raising taxes, in contrast to the budget of our friends on the other side of the aisle and the President's budget, I might add, that never, ever, ever gets to balance.

We reduce spending at the governmental level by \$5.5 trillion over a 10-year period of time, higher than any previous budget proposal. We call for a fairer and simpler Tax Code to promote job creation and a healthy economy. We repeal ObamaCare in its entirety, all of its taxes and regulations and its mandates so that we can put in place patient-centered health care, putting patients and families and doctors in charge of health care, not Washington, D.C., expanding the opportunity for access to quality, affordable health coverage. As I mentioned, we have a plan to save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid, things that are absolutely vital for the American people, and they understand that.

Our budget provides for a strong national defense, through robust funding of troop training and equipment and compensation. We promote innovation and flexibility in the area of Medicaid so that we can save that program, provide flexibility in the area of nutrition assistance and education and other programs. Our budget proposes to cut waste and eliminate redundancies and end the practice of Washington picking winners and losers in our economy, all the while calling for reforms to our Nation's regulatory system to improve transparency and effectiveness and efficiency and accountability.

Mr. Speaker, we have endorsed an optimistic vision, a vision for America's future by credibly—credibly—addressing our fiscal and economic challenges so that we can deliver real results for the American people. Since both the House and the Senate have passed our respective budgets, we must now work

together to iron out any differences that there may be between the two, and we need to come to an agreement for a unified fiscal year 2016 budget.

This conference committee is the next vital step in the days to come, and we will sit down and discuss how to advance these positive solutions in order to secure more economic growth and opportunity, hold Washington accountable, promote patient-centered health care, and ensure a strong national defense. We look forward to working with the Senate and the House Conference Committee and follow that with passage in this Congress of a unified budget to balance the budget in this Nation in less than 10 years.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would remind my colleague that when President Obama was sworn in, we were losing 780,000 jobs per month—per month. We were in a nosedive. It took a little while to climb out of that deep valley, but we have now had 61 consecutive months of positive job growth—12.1 million jobs, longest streak in history. So job growth is coming back. We have got a ways to go, no doubt about it. We need to do even better. That is why I don't understand a Republican budget that the Congressional Budget Office tells us will slow down economic growth in the next couple years. That is what the nonpartisan budget pros tell us: it will slow down economic growth. Our Republican colleagues say we don't have enough, and yet they have got a budget that the Congressional Budget Office says the next couple of years are going to slow it down just as we are continuing to grow at record levels.

They also have a budget, as I indicated, that says to people who are out there working hard: You are going to get squeezed even harder on your take-home pay. You are working harder than ever, but you know what? We are going to actually increase the tax burden on working families.

Now, let me say a little thing about this Medicare voucher plan. The way to reduce our healthcare costs is to move toward a system that rewards the delivery of value rather than volume in our healthcare system. And in fact, one of the great untold success stories we know over the last couple years has been because we have begun to move in that direction; we have saved trillions of dollars, over a trillion dollars, without sacrificing quality of care.

The problem with the Medicare voucher plan is it doesn't improve health care by changing the incentives to move toward more value and more quality rather than quantity and volume; it actually saves Medicare money by shifting the risk of higher costs onto seniors. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office says that under their plan, those who choose to stay in the fee-for-service system would pay 50 percent more in terms of premiums. So

that is the real-world impact of that proposal.

Now, what are the priorities of our Republican colleagues? We keep hearing that this is a balanced budget. It just isn't so. This is a phony argument. This budget says it is repealing the Affordable Care Act, and yet it only claims balance because of the revenues generated from the Affordable Care Act they claim to repeal. That would make Enron accountants blush.

What else? This Thursday in this House we are scheduled to vote on a proposal to get rid of the estate tax on estates for couples of over \$10 million—\$10 million. That is about 5,500 people a year. A cruise ship fits more people than that.

□ 1415

Here is what it does. For all of the estates in the country, let's just be clear what the Republican budget looks out for and what the bill they are bringing to the floor this week looks out for.

Blue, the 99.85 percent, are the estates that already are not impacted at all. The bill they are bringing to the floor of the House this week is for that teeny little sliver of red, .15 percent of estates.

That is what the Republican budget is all about, and that is what they are looking out for in a budget that cuts our kids' education funding, cuts our investment in scientific research, and increases the tax burden on working families. That is what this is all about.

Guess what, this estate tax cut for estates of couples over \$10 million is not factored into the Republican budget. That loses \$268 billion in revenue over the next 10 years. That is not accounted for in the budget they are talking about today.

Two days from today, they are going to bring to the floor a bill that busts their own budget. That is pretty amazing, and the claim that it balances is just a phony claim.

Finally, while it is providing those big tax breaks to estates of over \$10 million, it doesn't close a single tax loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit—not one, not for corporate jets, not for hedge fund managers, not one tax loophole closed, when they claim they want to reduce the deficit.

When you dig a little deeper, Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget is wrong for the country. It is great for folks who have already climbed that ladder. Most people who climb the ladder want to keep that ladder there, so more people can climb up, but this is a budget where people who climbed it just yanked the ladder up and said: We're on the top. Forget about the rest.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), one of the people who will be designated as one of my fellow conferees.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I could just sit down and say I agree with everything that the gentleman has said,

but I want to add my voice to this debate and rise to support the Democratic motion to instruct conferees.

As Mr. VAN HOLLEN has said, there are provisions in the Senate version that are very, very worthy of our adopting. There is the reserve fund on paid sick leave, and it also rejects the House provision on Medicare premium support, the vouchers.

I have been a member of this Budget Committee for over 5 years, and I can tell you that, while I have an appetite for leftovers, this has just been warmed over too many times. This budget is just another variation of the same themes that we have seen in the past several years.

What is this thing? The majority party has recommitment themselves to benefit the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans while balancing the budget on the backs of the poor.

Now, I know there are many people—unfortunately, on both sides of the aisle—who are not all that concerned about the poor. They figure that the poor have done this to themselves; but what has the middle class done to deserve being hollowed even more while we provide tax breaks for the wealthiest two-tenths of 1 percent?

What have hard-working men and women and cities and mayors all over this country done so that we just ignore infrastructure improvements, ignore devolving money to the States, all in the name of providing tax breaks for the richest of the rich?

Now, the commonsense approach would be to adopt our Democratic motion to instruct conferees, and it would be very much in league with the bipartisan actions we have seen over in the Senate. It has been historic, miraculous, to see 61 Senators—both Senators from my State, both parties—voting to establish a deficit neutral reserve fund to allow workers to earn paid sick leave. It is a filibuster-proof majority over there.

Paid sick leave is good for Americans, the 13 million working men and women who don't have paid sick leave when they need it. Millions are unable to take care of their sick kids, their parents, or their spouses because they can't afford to do it.

Workers have agonizing choices when their kids fall ill. Nearly a quarter of working adults have reported that they have lost or come close to losing their job, Mr. Speaker, for taking sick time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. MOORE. I will use it expeditiously.

I mean, 3½ days of pay loss is equivalent to a month of groceries. People can't afford to do it. It is not just good for people, it is good for our economy as well. People won't use the emergency room as much. There are 1.3 million emergency room visits every year

because we don't have sick leave. People won't come to work and pass communicable diseases with paid sick leave.

Again, the Medicare voucher is just a sham, Mr. Speaker. Senior citizens and people with disabilities rely on this for their health security. I guess the Republicans have said it time and again that they would like to see Medicare wither on the vine, and adopting the provisions in the House budget will in fact accomplish that.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), a member of the Budget Committee and Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my chairman for yielding me the time.

I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Maryland. I am just categorically opposed to the motion to instruct, but it is good that we are down here doing motions to instruct. Because what we have an opportunity to do, Mr. Speaker, for the first time since I was elected to this body 4 years ago, is to send House Members and Senate Members together and actually establish a budget of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't teasing. I was elected 4 years and 4 months ago, and this is the first time that we have been able to come together—and not just on a budget, but on a balanced budget—under the idea that it might be immoral to pay for our benefits today on the backs of our children yet to be born, that that might just be the wrong thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, in particular, in this motion to instruct, what troubles me is the attempt to do away with the Medicare premium support program that we have been working so hard to establish.

If anyone has a mom or dad who is on Medicare, if anybody is on Medicare themselves, they have experienced two things. They have experienced going into the doctor's office and questioning some provision of benefits, asking the question about whether or not this should be provided, whether or not this is the right cost, and they have had a physician say, they have had a hospital attendant say: What do you care? Medicare is going to pick that up.

You know it is true. Every single person has had that happen in their family, and the result of that is a Medicare Program that will not be there for us.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if everybody across the country knows, but everybody in this Chamber knows that most American families pay more in Medicare and Social Security taxes than they do in income taxes. The highest tax burden on most American families is not the income tax; it is the tax we pay for the promise that Social Security and Medicare will be there for us when we need it the most.

There is only one budget we have got to vote on in this town that solves that

Medicare issue, that says: You know what, we know the program is going to go bankrupt, and we know there are no easy solutions, but we are going to make the tough decisions today. We are not going to put it off until tomorrow.

My friend from Maryland said he wished the rules were different so that we could just substitute the Democratic budget for the budget that was passed in this House. Of course, that budget raised taxes by \$2 trillion and did nothing to solve this problem—nothing to solve this problem.

The Medicare premium support system holds the promise of keeping the commitments that we have made to every single working American through the Medicare and Social Security Programs.

If you didn't want to take tough votes, don't run for Congress. If you didn't want to be in the solutions business, you just wanted to be in the blame business, don't run for Congress.

If you want to be in the business of restoring the faith of the folks who pay that heavy tax burden, that the promises we make today will be there for them tomorrow, there is but one budget on Capitol Hill that fills that need, and this House had the wisdom to pass it. This House had the wisdom to pass it, Mr. Speaker.

I am so proud that, when we had an opportunity to either kick the can down the road or make the tough decisions, we said, Not on our watch will we break more of these promises. It is all done by giving patients more choice. Imagine that radical idea: give patients choice in their medical decisions.

Folks love their Medicare, Mr. Speaker, but they don't love it as much as they love their Medicare Advantage. Have you seen those numbers? Folks love their Medicare Advantage. For the first time in Medicare history, we gave patients choice. It is the most popular program in Medicare.

For reasons unbeknownst to me, this administration has been trying to stomp the life out of that program since the day it was elected, but the program persists because the American people love it.

You want to talk about doubling down on something, Mr. Speaker; we are doubling down on patient choice. We are doubling down on the idea that, if you put Americans in charge of their own healthcare decisions, they will make better decisions than the government will on their behalf.

We cannot fail at this. We cannot fail. We owe America a balanced budget, and we owe America the confidence that the promises we made in exchange for the highest tax bill that they pay will be there for them when they retire.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend and colleague from Georgia mentioned tough choices. It is in-

teresting that the Republican budget chooses not to cut one corporate tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Apparently, that is too touch of a choice for our Republican colleagues—not to close the corporate tax break, not to cut the tax break that benefits hedge fund managers.

They don't cut a single one of those tax breaks to help reduce our deficit, but they do want to increase the premiums on seniors who choose to stay in the traditional Medicare Program.

They may call it a choice, but for most Americans, if I say your premium is going to go up 50 percent, yeah, you can choose to have your premium go up, or you can go somewhere else.

That is not a heck of a real choice for most seniors who are struggling financially. Sure, it is a pay-to-stay plan, but you have got to pay a lot more in premiums, according to the Congressional Budget Office. It is not according to me; this is according to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office.

The Democratic budget does make the decision to close some of those special interest tax breaks to help reduce the long-term deficit, so we don't have to increase the costs and risks to seniors on Medicare, so we don't have to increase the cost on student loans and start charging students interest while they are still in college. No, we don't do that.

□ 1430

They are right. We think those are the right decisions that we made not to increase the costs of student loans and not to increase the costs and risks to seniors on Medicare.

Yes, we choose to cut some of those special interest tax breaks instead. And we certainly don't think that we should be providing another big tax break to those estates in the country worth more than \$10 million.

Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased now to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), another person who is going to be designated a conferee, a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland for yielding.

I like to read the comic strip in the paper every day, "The Wizard of Id," and, to me, the budgets that we have seen coming out of the House and Senate are kind of like "The Wizard of Id" budgets. He cast a magic spell, he went "poof," and all of a sudden we have created a balanced budget that is going to solve all this Nation's problems in the next 10 years. I don't think there are many gullible people out there who actually believe that will be the case.

But we know some things for certain in this budget. We know that many, many important government investments are going to be cut beyond any reasonable limit, and to dangerous limits.

We know, for instance, that within a matter of months, the highway trust fund is going to run out of money. We

have \$2 trillion worth of unmet infrastructure needs currently on the drawing board. These two budgets cut funding to make up some of that incredibly necessary infrastructure work.

This budget slashes money for innovation, for research. The one greatest advantage this country has in the global economy is our innovative talent. This budget says we can wait for that. Not in this world that is moving 100 miles an hour. We can't wait for that. Every time we cut research we are setting back, again, our greatest advantage for years.

As my colleague from Maryland mentioned, education: devastating cuts to Head Start, K-12 education, the one thing that can guarantee a hard-working American family's children the opportunity to succeed and have a life that they dream about.

So I fully support our motion to instruct. I think we deal with two problems that clearly face us and face working families throughout our country: the ability to actually care for yourself if you are sick, or your family member, and not lose income, something virtually every industrialized nation has. We can do that.

When my friend from Georgia talked about making hard choices, this is an easy choice. Let's not worry about too many of the hard choices. Let's make the easy ones that can help.

We can do comprehensive immigration reform, which is contemplated in the Democratic budget. That not only helps reduce the deficit, it solves one of our most daunting national challenges. We could do that. That would be an easy choice.

But we do have hard choices to make. The Republicans want to voucherize the Medicare system. They say it creates choice. It also puts insurance companies back in charge of seniors' health care. I am not sure American seniors look forward to that scenario.

So we want to go in a different direction, again, providing sick leave so that people can take care of their families without losing their income, and also involving doing away with the Medicare voucher system.

We think that this will help make the budget a better budget. It is still a disastrous budget, but I urge that we accept the motion to instruct.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK), a wonderfully contributing member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was recently asked, What one issue keeps you up at night? I answered in an instant, Our government's debt: a debt that has doubled in just 8 years, a debt that now exceeds the size of our entire annual economy, a debt that is generating interest costs that are now eating us alive, roughly a quarter-trillion dollars a year just to rent the money that we have already spent.

The Congressional Budget Office warns us, in 10 years, interest costs

will exceed our entire defense spending if we continue down the road we are on.

Admiral Mullen wasn't just blowing smoke when he said that, in his professional military judgment, the greatest threat to our national security was our national debt, because before you can provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare, you have to be able to pay for it, and the ability of our country to do so is coming into grave doubt.

For 4 years, this House had passed budgets that put our Nation back on the path to fiscal solvency and began paying down this enormous debt that is sapping our prosperity and threatening our futures. For 4 years, the Senate simply refused to act and, as the gentleman from Georgia said, we just kicked the can down the road.

Well, last November's election changed that. Now the Senate has also passed a budget that balances in 10 years.

Now, for the first time in many years, we have the fleeting opportunity to invoke a conference process and put this Nation back on the road to solvency. Time is not our friend, and we don't have much of it left.

The conference committee must have full latitude to act on a budget that both Houses can agree to, and the Democratic motion would hamstring that conference.

My friend from Maryland, on behalf of the House Democrats, says this budget isn't right for America. Well, America needs to know that the Democratic budget never balances. It would continue our country down the road of debt and doubt and despair that we have been on during these long, cold years.

The gentleman from Maryland criticizes premium support to save Medicare. Well, Americans need to know that the Medicare trustees themselves are screaming this warning at us, that, without reform, Medicare will bankrupt within 15 years. That means if you are 50 years or younger, it won't be there for you.

When the Democrats say don't reform Medicare, what they mean is they are quite all right with that system collapsing on an entire generation of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, all that stands between this Nation and the road to solvency and recovery is the conference process that can produce a plan to balance the budget, and all that stands against that, an unfettered conference process, is this motion.

As I said, we don't have much time left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. With my remaining time, let me suggest that, with the time our country has left, we do something worthy of our time here, that we balance our budget, redeem our debt, and save our country.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just make two points. The first, as I mentioned earlier, one of the great untold success stories of the Affordable Care Act reforms, as well as other reforms in the health care system in recent years, is that we have dramatically reduced the cost of health care on a per capita basis.

In other words, the increased costs per person of health care have been dramatically slowed down, according to the Congressional Budget Office, which has helped save Medicare and other health care programs over \$1 trillion. That is the right way to do it, by realigning the incentives so we are rewarding value in our Medicare system, not volume, as opposed to the Republican voucher plan, which saves money by shifting the risk onto seniors.

The other point—and we have talked about this over and over—it just ain't so that the Republican budget balances. Again, it requires the revenue from the Affordable Care Act, that amount of revenue, in order to balance, at the same time they say they are getting rid of it.

Two days from now, they are going to add over \$268 billion to the deficit by getting rid of the estate tax for estates over \$10 million. That is not accounted for in their budget. It puts their budget out of balance.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), another member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I would join in urging my colleagues to defeat this Democratic motion to instruct the conferees, and I do so very much tied to the working families that I talked to back home because working families back home believe in balancing the checkbook. They have to do it every day in their lives.

What they say to me is, Why in the world can't you guys do the same up in Washington, D.C.?

In that regard, if we were to go the other route—I mean, keep in mind, the President's budget proposed going from running structural \$500 billion a year deficits to \$1.1 trillion a year deficits. This is moving in the wrong direction if we go with the instructions.

I think that when I talk to working families back home, what they tell me is we have got to deal with problems as they come along. Doing nothing is not an option.

So when there is a hole in the roof, they are out there with tin or they are out there with shingles and they are, in fact, repairing the roof. When there is a problem with the septic tank, they are out there with a shovel, digging and trying to fix it.

In the same regard, I think what the committee and what the conference

have come up with with regard to looking at a way of saving Medicare could be very, very instructive. As has already been noted, within 15 years, the actuaries say that the Medicare fund will be out of money. Doing nothing is, indeed, not an option.

I think philosophically you have got to look at this and say, Did Medicare D work? It has worked. This is giving choice.

So, in essence, 50 million seniors get to decide the future of Medicare versus 15 unelected bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

Finally, I would say, what is important about this, I think, from the standpoint of working families, what they tell me is that borrowing from Peter to pay for Paul never works. It doesn't work in their budgets at home; it shouldn't work in Washington, D.C.

Yet, with this proposal to come up with paid sick leave, a lot of people would love that, but it ought to be addressed at the State level. States run on balanced budget requirements. A number of States could come in with proposals to that effect, but if we do it here in Washington, D.C., at the very time when we are running structural \$500 billion deficits, it means that we are handing the bill off to the kids to pay for this. We are, indeed, borrowing from Peter to pay for Paul.

It is for those very reasons that I urge defeat of the Democratic motion to instruct.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Who has the right to close, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has the right to close.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. May I inquire as to whether or not the gentleman has any more speakers?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I do not. I am prepared to close.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the comments that have been made by my colleagues to bring into focus the positive solutions that we have been working for with our budget. I reluctantly oppose the motion to instruct, as it compromises the ability of the conference committee to fashion the best possible solution.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, however, that the distortions that have been presented, I think they have gone past frustrating the American people. They anger the American people about the distortion of positions here in Washington. The American people are smarter than that.

Our side of the aisle, we are interested in making certain that we assist all Americans, every single American,

so that he or she has the greatest opportunity to realize the greatest amount of success in their own dreams, in their own lives, in the way that they deem to be most appropriate, not with Washington dictating to them what they must do.

□ 1445

I want to touch on a couple of very specific issues that have been mentioned by my friend from Maryland and others on the other side of the aisle.

Our balanced budget proposal gets to balance within a 10-year period of time. It does so without raising taxes, and it increases growth. Now, the growth is important, Mr. Speaker, and our friends mentioned it on the other side of the aisle, as if the policies that have been in place over the past 6 years had some magical solution that they increased growth in this country.

Well, the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that as we see it in this chart—this is from the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, as my friend from Maryland says. These are the projections of growth that the Congressional Budget Office has had over the last 4 years.

Four years ago, 3.0 percent. The average, Mr. Speaker, as you all well know, is about 3.3 percent over the last 40 years, growth in this country. That is in the economy, growing every year, 3.3 percent on average. And the projection 4 years ago was that it would be 3 percent. Three years ago, it was down to 2.9 percent; 2 years ago, 2.5 percent; this year, 2.3 percent. This is lost jobs, lost opportunity, fewer dreams realized all because of the policies coming out of Washington, D.C., and our friends on the other side want to double down on those policies.

Our proposal, our budget that gets to balance—which our friends on the other side of the aisle and their budget never does; the President's budget never gets to balance; something that folks back home can't do. They can't do it in their personal lives. They can't do it in their businesses. Our budget gets to balance and increases growth—increases growth—because that is what we have got to do. We have got to increase growth in this economy so that more dreams can be realized, more jobs can be created, wages can be increased. The way you increase wages is to increase the vitality of the economy, not have Washington dictate it to people.

And then this tired old characterization of our proposal to save and strengthen and secure Medicare and the way that it is characterized is to voucherize it. Well, this is nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and the American people know it.

What we propose to do is to save Medicare, not allow it to die on the vine, which is what our friends on the other side of the aisle apparently want to do. Because when you read their policies, they don't do anything to address the insolvency of Medicare that

is coming in a very short period of time—not according to me, but according to the Medicare trustees—and what that means is that patients, seniors, won't be able to get provided the services that they have been promised. That is not the right thing to do, Mr. Speaker.

Our friends on the other side talk about all the tax loopholes, and goodness knows we have been for cutting tax loopholes and closing tax loopholes before closing tax loopholes was cool. We just can't get out and get folks to rally to the cause in a positive way from our friends on the other side of the aisle.

My friend from Maryland knows that the way that that is fashioned is in the Ways and Means Committee. It is not in the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee lays out the vision, lays out the plan, lays out the parameters that are able to be utilized. As my friend from Maryland knows, the Ways and Means Committee is actively working right now—actively working right now—on appropriate tax reform.

It was the tax reform proposal that was put forward by our side of the aisle last year that demonstrated our willingness and desire to close loopholes and to end special treatments through the Tax Code. We believe everybody ought to be treated equally in the Tax Code, not have Washington picking winners and losers, which is what our friends on the other side tend to desire.

Then again, this distorted notion about healthcare costs and where healthcare costs are going right now. Healthcare costs are down. That is right, Mr. Speaker. Who are they down for? They are down for the Federal Government. Who are they not down for? The American people. That is who they are not down for.

What we have done with the President's healthcare program is to shift huge costs—huge costs—to the American people. If you are an individual out there, you make \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 right now, and the coverage that you are able to purchase right now—because ObamaCare has a deduction, has a deductible in your health plan of between \$6,000 and \$12,000, which countless Americans have right now. Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you don't have health coverage because you can't afford the deductible. But that is the proposal that our friends on the other side of the aisle embrace. That is the one that they want to put forward.

And who are they harming? They are harming the American people, and the American people know it. They know there is a better solution. They know that there is a better way. There is a positive way, a patient-centered solution manner to be able to get health care back on track, and that is what we propose in the area of health care.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I think I have got one more speaker who is desirous of coming to the floor, so I will reserve the balance of my time.



Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Let me inquire, once again, Mr. Speaker, if I may, of how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Well, as I await one of our Members who is heading to the floor to share his concerns about the motion to instruct, let me just revisit, once again, the positive solutions that we have put forward in our budget.

This is a balanced budget for a stronger America. It is a budget that gets to balance within a 10-year period of time and does so without raising taxes. It recognizes that the American people have realized not the full glory of ObamaCare yet, but they have seen enough. And they recognize that it is harming not just their health care; it is harming the economy.

So we repeal all of ObamaCare—yes, all of it, taxes, regulations, mandates, all of it—and we do so, again, not just because it is harming the economy, but, as a formerly practicing physician, I can tell you it is harming the health care of the American people.

We eliminate the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Mr. Speaker, as you know, that is the 15-member panel that was prescribed for by the Affordable Care Act, by ObamaCare, that stipulates to physicians whether or not they are going to pay the doctor for services rendered to seniors not just before the fact of the care being provided, but after the fact, harming the ability of seniors to be able to access quality care in this country.

We provide for a strong national defense, the resources necessary for a strong national defense, and do so at a level above the President's level.

We secure our future in the area of Medicare and Medicaid and provide an idea for how we make certain that the Social Security disability trust fund does not go broke and moves forward in a positive way.

We restore the issue of Federalism, increasing choices and opportunity for the American people at the local level, whether it is in Medicaid or nutrition assistance or in the area of education or other programs.

And then finally, Mr. Speaker, we cut waste and corporate welfare and improve accountability. We do so by ending the practice of Washington picking winners and losers. We call for reform for the regulatory system so that we increase transparency and efficiency and effectiveness and accountability.

It is a positive solution, a positive solution that the American people have been crying out for. They have been crying out for not just solutions here, but leadership here in Washington.

My colleagues on our side of the aisle have talked about how enthusiastic

they are about the opportunity to have the Senate and the House come together, come together for a positive solution in the area of budget process and budget activity. So I am pleased that the gentleman from Maryland brought the motion to instruct forward. As I say, I reluctantly have to oppose it because I think it compromises and ties the hands of individuals within the conference committee.

I urge a "no" vote on the motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, the Republican budget doesn't balance. You can't claim the revenues from the Affordable Care Act at the same time you claim to repeal the Affordable Care Act. You can't claim balance and then 2 days later bring to the floor of the House a bill that provides tax breaks to American estates over \$10 million that is not accounted for in the budget that you claim balanced. So it doesn't balance.

It actually does increase the tax burden on working families. How? Again, it gets rid of the increase in the child tax credit; it gets rid of the bump-up in the earned income tax credit; it eliminates the Affordable Care Act tax credits; and it eliminates the higher education deduction that helps families afford to send their kids to college. So, in fact, it is increasing the tax burden on working families.

Who is it not increasing the tax burden on? Folks at the very, very top.

The chairman of the committee talks about economic growth. We need economic growth. History has taught us that economic growth comes when you have a country where the hard work of Americans and increased worker productivity is translated into higher pay and benefits so they can go out and spend money on goods and services, and the economy and everybody can move forward together.

What we have got in this budget is the same old-same old. This is trickle-down economics all over again. This is based on the theory that has been disproven in the real world, that you grow the economy by cutting tax rates for millionaires. We tried that in the early 2000s. What happened? Surprise, surprise. The incomes of folks at the very top went up. Incomes of everybody else, flat. What else went up? Deficits went up.

The chairman says the Republican budget is a budget for all Americans. Two days from today they are going to bring to the floor a bill that gets rid of the estate tax for estates over \$10 million, 0.15 percent, about 5,500 American families. As I said earlier, you can put more people on a cruise ship. That is who the Republican budget looks after.

Now, look. The Democratic budget, it takes the opposite approach. It actually provides tax relief for working families. Yes, we do close some tax breaks for special interests to help reduce our long-term deficit.

We also call for increasing the minimum wage for millions of Americans who are working hard every day, yet at the end of the year, the amount they earn still puts them below the Federal poverty level. That is not right.

We also call for equal pay for equal work. Today is Equal Pay Day. Today represents the number of days since the end of last year, the number of days more that women have to work to achieve the same pay as men in the workplace. That is not right, and the Democratic budget addresses that issue.

We also say it is not right that corporations should be able to cut their employee pay or cut their workforce and still get a tax deduction for CEO and executive bonuses over \$1 million. Right? Pay your CEOs whatever bonus you want, pay your executives whatever bonus you want, but for goodness' sake, why should they get a tax deduction for those bonuses if they are not increasing the pay of their own workers? That is not right. That is what the Democratic budget says: we should get rid of that inequity and actually use the Tax Code not to incentivize corporate jets, but actually to incentivize greater pay for more workers.

And this motion to instruct also says, for goodness' sake, let's do what the Senate agreed to do. Let's do what the Senate agreed to do. Let's call for an earned paid sick leave provision so that families don't have to say that, in order to take care of a sick loved one at home, they have to forgo the paycheck that allows them to pay their rent and the mortgage and put food on the table.

And yes, we do not believe that you should turn Medicare into a voucher plan. We have put forward proposals for reform to move toward a system that rewards value over volume.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, despite passing on the risks of higher health care costs to seniors through that plan, there is not a shred of evidence that that plan in this particular budget will actually do anything in the end to help Medicare other than to shift that burden onto seniors.

So the Republican budget is the wrong way to go for the country. It is a budget based on a failed ideology that somehow we are going to grow our economy through trickle-down economics, top-down, trickle-down. That failed our economy.

Let's have an economy based on broadly shared prosperity. Let's reject the Republican budget, accept the motion to instruct, and ultimately adopt the Democratic alternative.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1500

## PRESERVING ACCESS TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING ACT OF 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 189, I call up the bill (H.R. 650) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 189, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 650

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act of 2015”.

### SEC. 2. MORTGAGE ORIGINATOR DEFINITION.

Section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (cc) and subsection (dd) as subsections (dd) and (ee), respectively; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(C) of subsection (dd), as so redesignated, by striking “an employee of a retailer of manufactured homes who is not described in clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) and who does not advise a consumer on loan terms (including rates, fees, and other costs)” and inserting “a retailer of manufactured or modular homes or its employees unless such retailer or its employees receive compensation or gain for engaging in activities described in subparagraph (A) that is in excess of any compensation or gain received in a comparable cash transaction”.

### SEC. 3. HIGH-COST MORTGAGE DEFINITION.

Section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (aa) (relating to disclosure of greater amount or percentage), as so designated by section 1100A of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, as subsection (bb);

(2) by redesignating subsection (bb) (relating to high cost mortgages), as so designated by section 1100A of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, as subsection (aa), and moving such subsection to immediately follow subsection (z); and

(3) in subsection (aa)(1)(A), as so redesignated—

(A) in clause (i)(I), by striking “(8.5 percentage points, if the dwelling is personal property and the transaction is for less than \$50,000)” and inserting “(10 percentage points if the dwelling is personal property or is a transaction that does not include the purchase of real property on which a dwelling is to be placed, and the transaction is for less than \$75,000 (as such amount is adjusted by the Bureau to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index))”; and

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) in subclause (I), by striking “or” at the end; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) in the case of a transaction for less than \$75,000 (as such amount is adjusted by

the Bureau to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index) in which the dwelling is personal property (or is a consumer credit transaction that does not include the purchase of real property on which a dwelling is to be placed) the greater of 5 percent of the total transaction amount or \$3,000 (as such amount is adjusted by the Bureau to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index); or”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I start, I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and the leadership that he has shown in his ability to work with us and allow us to do these commonsense pieces of legislation that help our districts all over this country, especially my home State of Tennessee and the Eighth Congressional District. So I just want to definitely make sure I thank him for his leadership and support.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be the sponsor of H.R. 650, the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act. Access to affordable housing is of vital importance to families in my district and all across the United States. Unfortunately, due to CFPB mortgage regulations that do not reflect the unique nature of the manufactured home sales process, access to financing for manufactured homes is in serious jeopardy.

Manufactured housing serves as a critical option for those who cannot otherwise afford to buy a home. Homes are commonly available at lower monthly payments than what it costs to rent. And the average price of a manufactured home is less than \$43,000, compared to an average price of \$177,000 for a site-built home. Almost three-quarters of families living in manufactured homes have annual incomes under \$40,000.

But this important source of homeownership for American families is being threatened by current high-cost mortgage rules that are too inflexible and often lead to the denial of financing for certain homes, particularly those that are lower priced, more affordable options.

Since the CFPB's Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act “high cost” rules consider cost as a percentage of a loan, smaller size loans, like manufactured home loans, often violate points

and fee caps. Manufactured home loans are typically associated with fixed interest rates, full amortization, shorter loan terms, and the absence of alternative features, such as balloon payments, negative amortization, no down payment loans, et cetera, to allow them to satisfy conservative and prudent underwriting standards, and H.R. 650 won't change this.

Because of the resulting “high-cost” designation and increased lender liability associated with it, some lenders have stopped making manufactured housing loans altogether, and others have stopped originating loans under \$20,000. Many community owners have said that their tenants are being forced to sell their homes well below market value to cash buyers because potential buyers can't find financing. These below-market sales don't just hurt sellers; they hurt every homeowner in the community who feels a huge loss on the equity of their home.

Additionally, since the CFPB's rule on the loan originator definition has gone into effect, retailers have been forced to stop providing technical assistance to consumers during the process of home buying. This bill modifies the definition of high-cost loans so that manufactured housing loans are not unfairly swept under the high-cost loan designation simply due to their size.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would help ensure the availability of financing options for manufactured homes while preserving the necessary consumer protections in the Dodd-Frank Act and the SAFE Act. Let me say that one more time. This bill would help ensure the availability of financing options for manufactured homes while preserving the necessary consumer protections in the Dodd-Frank Act and the SAFE Act.

H.R. 650 not only preserves Dodd-Frank's core consumer protections, but it helps consumers by restoring access to financing. Such financing enables working families and retirees to obtain housing that is much cheaper than renting or conventional home mortgage options.

CFPB, HUD, and State oversight of manufactured lending will continue. Consumers will continue to have the wide range of mortgage protections established by Dodd-Frank, including the QM “ability to repay” requirement, the prohibition on steering incentives, the prohibition against steering a consumer to a loan that has predatory characteristics, the prohibition on mandatory arbitration, loan term disclosure requirements, and the other State and Federal laws.

This bill is about ensuring access to affordable housing, especially in rural America, where rental properties are not as abundant as in urban areas. This bill enjoys broad bipartisan support by groups including the National Association of Realtors, the Mortgage Bankers Association, the Manufactured Housing Institute, the National Organization of African Americans in Housing, the National Association of Federal Credit